

Tang, L. H., Kikkenborg Berg, S., Christensen, J., Lawaetz, J., Doherty, P., Taylor, R. S., Langberg, H. and Zwisler, A.-D. (2017) Patients' preference for exercise setting and its influence on the health benefits gained from exercise-based cardiac rehabilitation. *International Journal of Cardiology*, 232, pp. 33-39. (doi:[10.1016/j.ijcard.2017.01.126](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijcard.2017.01.126)).

This is the author's final accepted version.

There may be differences between this version and the published version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/201382/>

Deposited on: 22 October 2019

Patients' preference for exercise setting and its influence on the health benefits
gained from exercise-based cardiac rehabilitation.

Author: Lars H Tang^{1,2,3}, Selina Kikkenborg Berg¹, Jan Christensen^{2,4}, Jannik Lawaetz^{1,2,3} Patrick Doherty⁵,
Rod S Taylor^{6,7,8}, Henning Langberg², Ann-Dorthe Zwisler⁸.

¹Department of Cardiology, The Heart Centre, Rigshospitalet, Copenhagen University Hospital,
Copenhagen, Denmark.

²CopenRehab, Section of Social Medicine, Department of Public Health, University of Copenhagen,
Denmark

³Bachelor's Degree Program in Physiotherapy, Dept. of Rehabilitation and Nutrition, Faculty of Health and
Technology, Metropolitan University College, Copenhagen, Denmark.

⁴Department of Occupational- and Physiotherapy Therapy, Rigshospitalet, Copenhagen University
Hospital, Copenhagen, Denmark

⁵Department of Health Sciences, University of York, England

⁶Institute of Health Research, University of Exeter Medical School, Exeter, England.

⁷National Institute of Public Health, University of Southern Denmark, Copenhagen, Denmark

⁸National Centre for Rehabilitation and Palliative Care, University of Southern and Odense University
Hospital, Denmark

"All authors take responsibility for all aspects of the reliability and freedom from bias of the data presented
and their discussed interpretation"

Key words: exercise training, cardiac rehabilitation, exercise setting, patient preference, Heart valve
diseases, atrial fibrillation.

Corresponding author

Lars H Tang: Lars.Hermann.Tang@regionh.dk

Word count: 3160 words.

Acknowledgement of grant support and any potential conflicts of interest: We acknowledge The Danish
Council for Strategic Research, Faculty of Health and Technology at Metropolitan University College and
the Association of Danish Physiotherapists for financial support. There were no conflicts of interest. All
financial support was provided as non-restricted research grants and the funders have no influence on the
trial design, the execution of the trial or the interpretation of the data.

33 **Abstract**

34 **Objective:**

35 To assess patient preference for exercise setting and examine if choice of setting influences the long-term
36 health benefit of exercise-based cardiac rehabilitation.

37 **Methods:**

38 Patients participating in a randomised controlled trial following either heart valve surgery, or radiofrequency
39 ablation for atrial fibrillation were given the choice to perform a 12-week exercise programme in either a
40 supervised centre-based, or a self-management home-based setting. Exercise capacity and physical and
41 mental health outcomes were assessed for up to 24 months after hospital discharge. Outcomes between
42 settings were compared using a time x setting interaction using a mixed effects regression model.

43 **Results:**

44 Across the 158 included patients, an equivalent proportion preferred to undertake exercise rehabilitation in a
45 centre-based setting (55 %, 95% CI: 45% to 63%) compared to a home-based setting (45%, 95% CI: 37%
46 to 53%, $p=0.233$). At baseline, those who preferred a home-based setting reported better physical health (mean
47 difference in physical component score: 5.0, 95 % CI 2.3 to 7.4; $p=0.001$) and higher exercise capacity
48 (mean between group difference 15.9 watts, 95 % CI 3.7 to 28.1; $p=0.011$). With the exception the
49 depression score in the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Score ($F(3.65)$, $p=0.004$), there was no evidence of
50 a significant difference in outcomes between settings.

51 **Conclusion:**

52 The preference of patients to participate in home-based and centre-based exercise programmes appears to be
53 equivalent and provides similar health benefits. Whilst these findings support that patients should be given
54 the choice between exercise-settings when initiating cardiac rehabilitation, further confirmatory evidence is
55 needed.

58 1. Introduction

59 Over recent years, cardiac rehabilitation (CR) has expanded from simple, single centre programmes into
60 large comprehensive programmes offering centre based and “home-based” delivery options.¹⁻³ Home-based
61 programmes are widely ranging from self-management programmes without any supervision to tele-
62 monitored supervised programmes. These can be delivered either in the patients’ home, or in a local non-
63 hospital location.^{4,5} Common to the expansions of alternative CR settings is an attempt to tailor CR towards
64 the preferences of a broader group of patients^{1,2,4} and, by doing so, tackle the very low uptake and adherence
65 rate that globally is reported in CR.⁶⁻⁹

66 Patient preference is known to determine whether patients participate in a trial and hypothesised to have
67 positive impact on adherence to interventions and outcomes.^{10,11} Evidence from one CR trial showed that
68 half of all patients will choose a home-based rehabilitation programme, when given the choice,¹² which is
69 perhaps surprising given that most CR programmes are delivered in traditional centre-based settings.⁶
70 Qualitative studies report that home-based programmes are preferred by some patients as they align with
71 their everyday life and their employment commitments.^{13,14} In contrast, patients preferring social events and
72 the possibility for specific exercise intensity monitoring are more likely to prefer a centre-based setting.¹³
73 These findings emphasise that it is unlikely that a single standardised CR model will fit all patients.

74 Physical exercise is a key element in CR¹⁵ and its benefits are well documented.¹⁶⁻¹⁹ Based on a systematic
75 review of the studies investigating exercise-based CR, Taylor and colleagues found similar health benefits
76 between centre-based and home-based interventions, at similar costs.²⁰ Hence, the authors concluded that
77 choice of setting should reflect preference of the individual patient.^{10,11} However, this conclusion was based
78 on study designs that randomised patients to either home or centre-based CR and failed to take into account
79 the preference of patients.²⁰ To our knowledge, only the study by Dalal et al.¹² has offered cardiac patients a
80 choice between centre-based rehabilitation classes over eight to ten weeks, or a home-based self-help
81 package of six weeks duration. The results showed no difference in patient outcomes. More evidence is,
82 therefore, needed in order to validate the benefits and consequence of allowing patients a choice between
83 settings for CR.

84 The CopenHeart trials were designed to investigate the effect of a similar comprehensive CR programme
85 across cardiac diagnoses, including atrial fibrillation and valve disease. Patients were randomised to either

86 usual care or a programme consisting of physical exercise training and psycho-education.
88 Once allocated to the intervention groups, patients were then given a choice between a supervised centre-
89 based setting and a self-management home-based programme, thus offering the opportunity to assess the
90 impact of choice.^{21,22}

91 The aims of this study were to assess if the choice of a CR exercise programme delivered either as a
92 traditional rehabilitation program in a supervised centre-based setting, or in a self-management home-based
93 setting would: 1) be equally preferred by patients and 2) provide similar patient health benefits over 24
94 months.

95 **2. Method**

96 **2.1 Design**

97 Data for this explorative study were pooled across the intervention arms from two CopenHeart parallel
98 group randomised controlled trials. All patients were informed about the trials both verbally
100 and in writing. Written informed consent was also obtained. Both trials were approved by the Data
101 Protection Agency (j.nr. 2007-58-0015) and Regional Ethical Committee (j.nr. H-1-2011-135, j.nr. H-1-
102 2011-157) and have been described in detail elsewhere.^{21,22}

103 **2.2 Inclusion criteria**

104 The inclusion criteria in the two trials were: patients who underwent either radiofrequency ablation for atrial
105 fibrillation, or heart valve surgery, age ≥ 18 years, ability to speak and understand Danish, and no
106 musculoskeletal system, or organ disease that would complicate undertaking physical activity.^{21,22}

107 **2.3 The intervention**

108 In the intervention group, a 12 week progressive exercise program three times weekly was begun one month
109 after hospital discharge. The program combined 20 minutes of aerobic training with four resistance
110 exercises. The aerobic training was accomplished on a stationary bike with exercise intensity according to
111 exercise-based guidelines in cardiac rehabilitation.^{15,23} The resistance training combined both strength and
112 strength-related exercises primarily targeting muscles in the lower extremities. Each single exercise session

113 was described in detail in an individual training diary given to patients, along with a heart monitor (Polar
114 Electro, Finland), when introduced to the exercise programme. All patients undertook the first training
115 session in the same tertiary centre hospital (Department of Cardiology). Thereafter, patients continued their
116 programme in one of two settings in accordance to patient preference: either a supervised centre-based
117 setting either at the tertiary hospital, at a local hospital or healthcare centre (across 29 certified collaborating
118 training locations where all personnel were educated and certified in delivering the exercise training
119 intervention), or as a self-management home-based programme performed either at home, or in a local
120 fitness centre with no additional staff supervision.

121 In both exercise setting, all patients were encouraged to perform moderate physical activity of 30 minutes a
122 day during the intervention period. In addition, all patients received one of five psycho-educational
123 consecutive nurse consultations every four to six weeks, during the first six months after discharge. All
124 consultations started within the first month following discharge and were performed either at the same
125 tertiary centre hospital, or by phone.

126 After the 12 weeks intervention period, patients were encouraged to continue exercising by themselves and
127 follow the clinical recommendations of 30 minutes physical activity each day.

128 2.4 Outcome assessment

129 We utilised all physical and mental outcomes common to both trials. Physical capacity was measured
130 objectively using a maximum cardiopulmonary exercise test using a ramp protocol on an ergometer bicycle.
131 Further with a six-minute walk test and a Sit-to-Stand (STS) test. Details of these test are described
132 elsewhere.^{21,22} All physical assessments were performed at one month, four months and one year post
133 discharge.

134 The level of physical activity was self-reported using the International Physical Activity Questionnaire short-
135 form (IPAQ).²⁴ The physical and mental component scales of the Short-Form 36 (SF-36) questionnaire²⁵
136 were used to assess self-reported generic mental health and the level of anxiety and depression were assessed
137 using the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS).²⁶ These patient reported outcomes were collected
138 at baseline, one, four, six 12 and 24 months after hospital discharge.

139 Adherence to each exercise session was assessed using a patient training diary and data from the heart rate
140 monitors worn during exercise.²⁷ Adherence to exercise was categorised into two groups in accordance with
141 the recommendation from Beauchamp et al,²⁸ i.e. patients participating in $\geq 75\%$ of the 36 training sessions
142 (i.e., 27 sessions) were categorised as ‘adherent’ and patients participating in $<75\%$ of all training sessions
143 as ‘non adherent’.

144 We assessed disease-specific symptoms using the “New York Heart Association (NYHA) class Functional
145 Classification’ in patients following heart valve surgery, or with a “European Heart Rhythm Association
146 (EHRA) score indicating atrial fibrillation related symptoms’ in patients who underwent an ablation for
147 atrial fibrillation. Level of comorbidity at baseline was calculated using the Charlson comorbidity index.²⁹

148 2.5 Statistical analyses

149 An independent two-sample t-test, or a Chi-square test was used to explore differences in patient
150 demographic, medical condition, exercise adherence and adverse events between the centre and home
151 settings. A one sample binomial test was used to compare the proportion of patients who preferred one
154 setting more than the other. We used a linear mixed effects regression model, adjusted for sex, age, and
155 diagnosis, to compare outcome differences at baseline. This same mixed effect model was used to compare
156 outcome differences over time between the two settings by introducing a time x setting interaction. All
157 models were run with and without adjustment for sex, age, and diagnosis. Level of statistical significant was
158 expressed as a $p < 0.05$. All statistical analyses were performed using the software SAS Enterprise Guide 5.1
159 (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC, USA).

160 3. Results

161 3.1 Trial flow

162 A total of 177 patients were allocated to the intervention group in the two randomised trials and were
163 included in the current study. An additional patient was included because they had received the intervention,
164 despite being allocated to the control group. Of these 178 patients, 20 patients had post treatment
165 complications, or voluntary withdrawal from the two trials before they were able to select an exercise setting.

166 Therefore, the results of 158 participating patients were analysed. There was no difference in preference for
167 the settings, i.e. centre-based setting was preferred by 55% (95% CI 45% to 63%)) versus 45% (95% CI 37%
168 to 53%), who preferred a home-based setting ($p=0.233$) (See Figure 1 for study flow). One patient was
169 reported to switch from a centre-based setting and into a home-based setting during the exercise period. This
170 patient was analysed as a centre-based participant as 2/3rds of their exercise intervention was accomplished
171 in a healthcare centre. In the centre-based setting, 64 (74%) patients attended all three test sessions and 68
172 (78%) answered their questionnaire booklet, at all times points during the study period. In comparison, these
173 numbers were 60 (85%) patients attended all three test sessions and 57 (78%) answered their questionnaire
174 booklet at all times points during the study period in the home-based setting.

175 3.2 Patient characteristics

176 Baseline characteristics by settings are reported in Table 1. Patients who underwent heart valve surgery more
177 often preferred a centre-based setting and vice versa for patients' that underwent an ablation ($p=0.002$). No
178 other baseline demographic was found to be significantly different.

179 The adjusted mixed model showed better physical performance and health at baseline in patients who
180 preferred a home-based setting expressed by increased maximum watt level during bicycle testing (mean
181 difference 15.9 (95 % CI 3.7-28.1; $p=0.011$) and increased SF-36 physical component scale score (mean
182 difference 5.0 (95 % CI 2.3-7.6; $p=0.001$)). No other outcome variables were found to be different at
183 baseline between the two settings.

184 The results of exercise adherence, based on the individual exercise diary and HR-monitor, were similar
185 between the two settings ($p=0.435$). Approximately 60% of all patients participated in $\geq 75\%$ of the 36
186 training session (see Table 1). No adverse events as a consequence to the exercise intervention were
187 reported. Fifteen adverse events were reported but no different were found between the two settings (centre-
188 based settings: 6 events versus home-based setting; 9 events, $P=0.218$). One patient in both of the two
189 settings reported atrial fibrillation in relation to the exercise intervention. Remaining events were
190 musculoskeletal primarily in the lower extremities.

191 3.3 Over time differences between the centre and home based setting

Mean physical and patient-reported outcomes over time are shown in Figures 2 and 3 and detailed in e-Tables (appendix A and B). There was evidence of higher HADS depression score in the centre-based group ($F(3.65)$, $p=0.004$) (Figure 3b). No other outcomes differed over time between the two settings. Adjustments for sex, age and diagnosis did not affect the interpretation of these results.

4. Discussion

This study provides important insights into patient's choice for alternative modes for provision in exercise-based CR and the impact that such choice is likely to have. We found an equivalent proportion of patients choose a traditional centre-based setting or a self-management home-based setting, with similar improvements in health benefits in the two settings after two years, with the exception of HADS depression.

Our findings suggest that there is no difference in patients' outcome between centre and home-based CR with the exception of a small difference in HADS depression. This result of no difference between the two settings is in accord with Dalal et al, who previously investigated the influence of self-preferred setting in CR.¹² However, where Dalal and colleagues offered a different intervention in the a centre-based setting compared to the home-based setting (i.e. either hospital-based rehabilitation classes over eight to ten weeks, or a self-help package of six weeks duration supported by a nurse), we offered the same structured exercise intervention based upon CR guidelines in the two settings. Despite the variation between studies, they both suggest that patients can prefer a CR setting and archive similar health benefits.

Based on evidence from randomised control trials, it is suggested that the exercise setting should reflect patients' preference.²⁰ Randomisation to exercise settings will reduce types of systematic bias between setting but can result in eliminating motivational variables, such as preference to a specific setting.^{10,11} Thus, our paper is the first to investigate if same structured exercise intervention performed in a home-based setting will provide comparable clinical benefits to those in a centre-based setting, when choice of setting reflects the preference of the individual patient.

Evidence investigating the long-term effects in CR (≥ 1 year follow up) across CR settings is sparse. Similar to our findings, Marchionni et al³⁰ and Jolly et al^{31,32} report no difference in patient outcomes between home and centre-based settings after 14 months and, 12 and 24 months respectively. In contrast, Smith and colleagues report better maintenance of patient benefits and higher physical activity in those who have been allocated to home-based programs after one and six years.^{33,34}

220 The proportion of patients who preferred a home-based setting in this study may seem high. However, Dalal
221 et al¹² reported slightly higher percentage of patients (57% of 126 patients) preferring a home-based CR
222 program compared to centre-based.

223 Our study shows that diagnosis may affect preferences in CR as patients who underwent heart valve
224 replacement preferred traditional centre-based setting and patients who underwent ablation for atrial
225 fibrillation preferred home-based CR. Dalal et al¹² reported that patients with acute myocardial infarction had
226 a higher preference to perform a self-management CR manual at home. In addition, qualitative studies show
227 that a home-based setting is preferred by patients who would appreciate a programme that can be
228 incorporated into their everyday life, or by patients who find participating in traditional CR restrictive.^{13,14}
229 Furthermore, patients with higher income appear to choose a home-based CR programme.³⁵ The results of
230 this study strengthen the current evidence by offering further insight into the patient characteristics,
231 suggesting that patients with better physical condition and health prefer the home-based setting.

232 4.1 Strength and limitations

233 An important strength in the present study is the possibility for patients to undertake the exercise intervention
234 in a centre-based environment located closer to home as routinely offered in everyday clinical practice. A
235 single-centre design would have influenced the preference for the exercise intervention, due to longer
236 distances to the centre-based training location.³⁶ An additional strength is the exploration of long-term effects
237 between exercise settings (24 months) where evidence is sparse. Nonetheless, our findings need to be
238 interpreted with caution. Firstly, as this is an explorative study it only allow us to express trends in the data.³⁷
239 Given the explorative design and the relative low number of patients, post hoc analysis were not performed
240 to explore variation between two time points (e.g. differences in settings from 1 month to 4 months).

241 Secondly, being a non-randomised study with allocation based upon patients' preference to either a home, or
242 a centre-based setting, selection bias or confounding is likely to occur when comparing the outcomes
243 between the two settings. We considered this by adjusting for important potential confounders, i.e. age,
244 gender, diagnosis. In addition, we found no baseline difference in employment status, marital status, disease
245 severity or HADS depression or anxiety scores. Nevertheless, given the non-randomised nature of the
246 comparison in this study we recognise that other unmeasured psychosocial factors may have confounded our
247 results. Thirdly, the data used in this study were taken from two randomised controlled trials not designed

for the purpose of this paper. Thus, only the follow-up assessments and outcomes common for both trials were included for analysis (e.g., objective measures of physical capacity were not obtained at 24 months and measurement of disease-specific quality of life was excluded). Finally, data are limited to patients who had undergone either heart valve surgery or treatment for atrial fibrillation. Thus, the results may not be generalisable to all cardiac diagnoses. In addition our patient group was somewhat younger compared to other CR patient groups. However, Oerkild et al³⁸ have reported that elderly (≥ 65 years) patients with coronary heart disease also experience similar effects when participating in CR in a home-based setting compared to a centre-based setting. Still, we acknowledge that age could impact the results of this study, especially in relation to patients choice of exercise setting.³⁹

5. Conclusion

This study investigated patients' preference for undertaking a 12-week CR programme delivered in either a supervised centre-based setting, or a self-management home-based setting and how this impacted on long-term health benefits. Whilst we found that, on average, both settings were preferred equally among participants, it is noted, that the preference of individual patients are likely to be influenced by their diagnosis and physical condition. Despite these potential differences in the preference of individual patients, similar health benefits are achieved in both settings. Our results support future tailoring of CR programmes towards patients' needs and preferences. Further research is needed to inform the implementation of patient-preferred approaches to cardiac rehabilitation.

6. Acknowledgments

We thank everyone who participated. We especially thank physiotherapists Helena Tjalk-Bøggild, Signe Gils, Graziella Zangger and Katrine Thingholm Erhardsen for introducing all patients to the exercise intervention. We acknowledge the Danish Council for Strategic Research (number: 10-092790), Faculty of Health and Technology at Metropolitan University College and the Association of Danish Physiotherapists for financial support. A special thanks to Merja Perhonen and Juhani Perhonen, (Corus Fit inc, Jyväskylä,

276 Finland) for developing the training diary and cooperating on the CopenHeart protocols and safety
277 procedures.

278 **7. Conflict of interest**

279 The authors report no relationships that could be construed as a conflict of interest.

280 8. References

- 281 1. Franklin BA, Hall L, Timmis GC. Contemporary cardiac rehabilitation services. *Am J Cardiol*
282 1997; 79: 1075–1077.
- 283 2. Dalal HM, Doherty P, Taylor RS. Cardiac rehabilitation. *BMJ* 2015; 351: h5000.
- 284 3. Jelinek MV, Thompson DR, Ski C, et al. 40 years of cardiac rehabilitation and secondary
285 prevention in post-cardiac ischaemic patients. Are we still in the wilderness? *Int J Cardiol*
286 2015; 179: 153–159.
- 287 4. Clark RA, Conway A, Poulsen V, et al. Alternative models of cardiac rehabilitation: A
288 systematic review. *Eur J Prev Cardiol* 2015; 22: 35–74.
- 289 5. Blair J. Home versus hospital-based cardiac rehabilitation: a systematic review. *Rural Remote*
290 *Health* 2011; 11: 1532.
- 291 6. Bjarnason-Wehrens B, McGee H, Zwisler A-D, et al. Cardiac rehabilitation in Europe: results
292 from the European Cardiac Rehabilitation Inventory Survey. *Eur J Cardiovasc Prev Rehabil*
293 *Off J Eur Soc Cardiol Work Groups Epidemiol Prev Card Rehabil Exerc Physiol* 2010; 17:
294 410–418.
- 295 7. Hansen TB, Berg SK, Sibilitz KL, et al. Availability of, referral to and participation in
296 exercise-based cardiac rehabilitation after heart valve surgery: Results from the national
297 CopenHeart survey. *Eur J Prev Cardiol* 2015; 22: 710–718.
- 298 8. Mikkelsen T, Korsgaard Thomsen K, Tchijevitch O. Non-attendance and drop-out in cardiac
299 rehabilitation among patients with ischaemic heart disease. *Dan Med J* 2014; 61: A4919.
- 300 9. Turk Adawi K. Global availability of cardiac rehabilitation. *Nat Rev Cardiol* 2014; 11: 586–
301 596.
- 302 10. King M, Nazareth I, Lampe F, et al. Conceptual framework and systematic review of the
303 effects of participants' and professionals' preferences in randomised controlled trials. *Health*
304 *Technol Assess Winch Engl* 2005; 9: 1–186, iii–iv.
- 305 11. Brewin CR, Bradley C. Patient preferences and randomised clinical trials. *BMJ* 1989; 299:
306 313–315.
- 307 12. Dalal HM, Evans PH, Campbell JL, et al. Home-based versus hospital-based rehabilitation
308 after myocardial infarction: A randomized trial with preference arms--Cornwall Heart Attack
309 Rehabilitation Management Study (CHARMS). *Int J Cardiol* 2007; 119: 202–211.
- 310 13. Wingham J, Dalal HM, Sweeney KG, et al. Listening to Patients: Choice in Cardiac
311 Rehabilitation. *Eur J Cardiovasc Nurs* 2006; 5: 289–294.
- 312 14. Madden M, Furze G, Lewin RJP. Complexities of patient choice in cardiac rehabilitation:
313 qualitative findings. *J Adv Nurs* 2011; 67: 540–549.
- 314 15. Piepoli MF, Corrà U, Carré F, et al. Secondary prevention through cardiac rehabilitation:
315 physical activity counselling and exercise training: key components of the position paper from
316 the Cardiac Rehabilitation Section of the European Association of Cardiovascular Prevention
317 and Rehabilitation. *Eur Heart J* 2010; 31: 1967–1974.
- 318 16. Taylor RS, Sagar VA, Davies EJ, et al. Exercise-based rehabilitation for heart failure.
319 *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2014; 4: CD003331.


- 320 17. Anderson L, Thompson DR, Oldridge N, et al. Exercise-based cardiac rehabilitation for
321 coronary heart disease. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2016; 1: CD001800.
- 322 18. Anderson L, Taylor RS. Cardiac rehabilitation for people with heart disease: an overview of
323 Cochrane systematic reviews. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2014; 12: CD011273.
- 324 19. Sibilitz KL, Berg SK, Tang LH, et al. Exercise-based cardiac rehabilitation for adults after
325 heart valve surgery. In: *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. John Wiley & Sons,
326 Ltd <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/14651858.CD010876/abstract> (1996, accessed
327 16 December 2013).
- 328 20. Taylor RS, Dalal H, Jolly K, et al. Home-based versus centre-based cardiac rehabilitation. In:
329 *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 2015.
- 330 21. Risom SS, Zwisler A-DO, Rasmussen TB, et al. The effect of integrated cardiac rehabilitation
331 versus treatment as usual for atrial fibrillation patients treated with ablation: the randomised
332 CopenHeartRFA trial protocol. *BMJ Open*; 3. Epub ahead of print 2013. DOI:
333 10.1136/bmjopen-2012-002377.
- 334 22. Sibilitz KL, Berg SK, Hansen TB, et al. Effect of comprehensive cardiac rehabilitation after
335 heart valve surgery (CopenHeartVR): study protocol for a randomised clinical trial. *Trials*
336 2013; 14: 104.
- 337 23. The Danish National Board of Health. National clinical guidelines for cardiac rehabilitation
338 [National klinisk retningslinje for hjerterehabilitering]. Copenhagen: The Danish National
339 Board of Health, 10 November 2013.
- 340 24. Craig CL, Marshall AL, Sjöström M, et al. International physical activity questionnaire: 12-
341 country reliability and validity. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2003; 35: 1381–1395.
- 342 25. Ware JE. SF-36 Health Survey: Manual & Interpretation Guide. The Health Institute, New
343 England Medical Center., 2005.
- 344 26. Zigmond AS, Snaith RP. The hospital anxiety and depression scale. *Acta Psychiatr Scand*
345 1983; 67: 361–370.
- 346 27. Conraads VM, Deaton C, Piotrowicz E, et al. Adherence of heart failure patients to exercise:
347 barriers and possible solutions: a position statement of the Study Group on Exercise Training
348 in Heart Failure of the Heart Failure Association of the European Society of Cardiology. *Eur J*
349 *Heart Fail* 2012; 14: 451–458.
- 350 28. Beauchamp A, Worcester M, Ng A, et al. Attendance at cardiac rehabilitation is associated
351 with lower all-cause mortality after 14 years of follow-up. *Heart Br Card Soc* 2013; 99: 620–
352 625.
- 353 29. Charlson ME, Pompei P, Ales KL, et al. A new method of classifying prognostic comorbidity
354 in longitudinal studies: development and validation. *J Chronic Dis* 1987; 40: 373–383.
- 355 30. Marchionni N, Fattiroli F, Fumagalli S, et al. Improved exercise tolerance and quality of life
356 with cardiac rehabilitation of older patients after myocardial infarction: results of a
357 randomized, controlled trial. *Circulation* 2003; 107: 2201–2206.
- 358 31. Jolly K, Taylor R, Lip GY, et al. The Birmingham Rehabilitation Uptake Maximisation Study
359 (BRUM). Home-based compared with hospital-based cardiac rehabilitation in a multi-ethnic

- 360 population: cost-effectiveness and patient adherence. *Health Technol Assess Winch Engl* 2007;
361 11: 1–118.
- 362 32. Jolly K, Lip GYH, Taylor RS, et al. The Birmingham Rehabilitation Uptake Maximisation
363 study (BRUM): a randomised controlled trial comparing home-based with centre-based
364 cardiac rehabilitation. *Heart Br Card Soc* 2009; 95: 36–42.
- 365 33. Smith KM, Arthur HM, McKelvie RS, et al. Differences in sustainability of exercise and
366 health-related quality of life outcomes following home or hospital-based cardiac rehabilitation.
367 *Eur J Cardiovasc Prev Rehabil Off J Eur Soc Cardiol Work Groups Epidemiol Prev Card*
368 *Rehabil Exerc Physiol* 2004; 11: 313–319.
- 369 34. Smith KM, McKelvie RS, Thorpe KE, et al. Six-year follow-up of a randomised controlled
370 trial examining hospital versus home-based exercise training after coronary artery bypass graft
371 surgery. *Heart Br Card Soc* 2011; 97: 1169–1174.
- 372 35. Grace SL, McDonald J, Fishman D, et al. Patient preferences for home-based versus hospital-
373 based cardiac rehabilitation. *J Cardpulm Rehabil* 2005; 25: 24–29.
- 374 36. McDonall J, Botti M, Redley B, et al. Patient participation in a cardiac rehabilitation program.
375 *J Cardiopulm Rehabil Prev* 2013; 33: 185–188.
- 376 37. Portney LG, Watkins MP. Exploratory Research: Observational Designs. In: *Foundations of*
377 *Clinical Research: applications to practice*. Harlow: Pearson, 2014.
- 378 38. Oerkild B, Frederiksen M, Hansen JF, et al. Home-based cardiac rehabilitation is as effective
379 as centre-based cardiac rehabilitation among elderly with coronary heart disease: results from
380 a randomised clinical trial. *Age Ageing* 2011; 40: 78–85.
- 381 39. Filip J, McGillen C, Mosca L. Patient preferences for cardiac rehabilitation and desired
382 program elements. *J Cardpulm Rehabil* 1999; 19: 339–343.
- 383

384 **Figure legend:**

385 **Figure 1:** The exact numbers of patients that attended exercise testing and answered the questionnaire

386 booklet throughout the study period



389 **Figure 2:** Physical test outcomes presented over time and divided between the two exercise
390 settings.

391 Figure citations:

392 Data is presented as mean and the standard deviation.

393 P-values represent the test for time x setting interaction adjusted for adjusted for sex, age, and diagnosis

394

Insert figure 2a here

Insert figure 2b here

Insert figure 2c here

Insert figure 2d here

395 **Figure 3:** Patient reported outcomes by the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS), The short-form
396 36 (SF-36) and the International Physical Activity Questionnaire short-form (IPAQ) presented separately for
397 the two exercise settings over time.

398 Figure citations:
399 HADS and IPAQ is presented as median and Interquartile range.
400 SF-36 is presented as mean and the standard deviation.
401 P-values represent the test for time x setting interaction adjusted for adjusted for sex, age, and diagnosis
402
403





Table 1: Patients demographic, medical condition and exercise adherence compared between settings


	Centre-based (n=87)		Home-based (n=71)		
Demographic data	<i>n</i>	Mean (±SD)	<i>n</i>	Mean (±SD)	p-
Age	87	62.0 (10.3)	71	58.9 (9.8)	0.058
BMI	87	25.9 (4.2)	71	26.1 (4.2)	0.725
Sex (Female/Male)	23/64		17/54		0.720
Employment status		(%)		(%)	
Employed	42	(48%)	37	(52%)	0.631
Unemployed	45	(52%)	34	(48%)	
Marital status					
Living alone	14	(16%)	13	(18%)	0.713
Living with a partner	73	(84%)	58	(82%)	
Patient type					
Radiofrequency ablation	43	(49%)	52	(73%)	0.002
Valve replacement	44	(51%)	19	(27%)	
NYHA/EHRA class*					
I	41	(47%)	25	(35%)	0.163
II	32	(37%)	26	(37%)	
III	12	(14%)	19	(27%)	
IIII	2	(2%)	1	(1%)	
The Charlson comorbidity index					
0	79	(91%)	69	(97%)	0.187
≥1	8	(9%)	2	(3%)	
Medical Records					
Warfarin	71	(82%)	58	(82%)	0.990
B-Blockers	32	(37%)	39	(55%)	0.023
Calcium antagonists	23	(26%)	10	(14%)	0.057
Statin	34	(39%)	14	(20%)	0.009
Exercise adherence					
Participating in ≥27 exercise sessions	46	(56%)	40	(63%)	0.435


~Fischer Exact test


NYHA/EHRA class :The New York Heart Association (NYHA) Functional Classification/ European Heart Rhythm Association (EHRA) score of atrial fibrillation related symptoms
















Figure(s)

[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure(s)

[Click here to download high resolution image](#)



Figure(s)

[Click here to download high resolution image](#)



e-component

[Click here to download e-component: Appendix A.doc](#)

e-component

[Click here to download e-component: Appendix B.doc](#)